

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being submitted *via* the USPTO EFS Filing System on the date shown below to **Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents**, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450.

Date: January 16, 2009/Rebecca Stanford/
Rebecca Stanford**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re patent application of:

Applicant(s): Timothy S. Paek, *et al.*

Examiner: Kimberly M. Lovel

Serial No: 10/809,172

Art Unit: 2167

Filing Date: March 25, 2004

Title: WAVELENS SYSTEMS AND METHODS FOR SEARCH RESULTS

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REPLY BRIEF

Dear Sir:

Applicant submits this brief in connection with an appeal of the above-identified patent application. Payment is being submitted via credit card in connection with all fees due regarding this appeal brief. In the event any additional fees may be due and/or are not covered by the credit card, the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP607US].

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 are currently pending and are presently under consideration. Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments herein. In particular, the following comments address alleged deficiencies contended in the Examiner's Answer to applicants' Appeal Brief.

I. Regarding the Objection to Claim 19

The Examiner incorrectly objects to claim 19 on the grounds that it is an improper dependent claim. It is requested that this objection be reversed for at least the following reasons. Claim 19 is a proper dependent claim.

Claim 19 recites: *[a] computer readable medium having computer readable instructions stored thereon for implementing the components of claim 1*. Claim 1 recites: *[a] computer-implemented interface for data presentation embodied on a computer-readable storage medium, comprising: a lens component associated with a portion of a user interface display ...; and a layout component*. The claimed subject matter properly comprises a computer readable medium *having computer readable instructions stored thereon* for implementing the components of claim 1, wherein the components of claim 1 comprise a lens component and a layout component. Claim 1 does not include the limitation of the medium having computer readable instructions stored thereon. Further, claim 19 has recited a computer readable medium, as opposed to a computer readable storage medium, since filing of the instant application.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that this objection be reversed.

II. Regarding the Rejection of Claims 1-12, 15-17, and 19-27 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner incorrectly maintains the rejection of claims 1-12, 15-17, and 19-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the article "Visual Bracketing for Web Search Result Visualization" to Roberts *et al.* (hereinafter "Roberts *et al.*") in view of the article "Context Interaction in Zoomable User Interfaces" to Pook *et al.* (hereinafter "Pook *et al.*"). It is requested that this rejection be reversed for at least the following reason. Roberts *et al.* and Pook *et al.*, either alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest each and every element of the subject claims.

The claimed subject matter generally relates to automatic and dynamic presentation of search result information in accordance with an adjustable viewing lens that can balance the desire to examine a plurality of search results while promoting, expanding, or highlighting information of interest within the lens. (See Figs. 1 and 5; p. 2, lns. 23-26.) In particular, independent claim 1 recites: *a layout component that displays a detailed subset of information, comprising textual information, within the area defined by the lens component based upon the search result, the detailed subset of information is animated to enlarge in size and to include additional textual information that is selected from the at least one search result for insertion into the detailed subset of information based in part on a query associated with the at least one search result, as compared to the amount of information displayed for the at least one search result when outside of the area defined by the lens component.* Roberts *et al.* and Pook *et al.*, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest this distinctive aspect of the claimed subject matter.

Rather, Roberts *et al.* relates to a visual bracketing method that provides detail-in-context views where the inner part contains the Focus bracketed by the context information at a lower semantic level. (See Abstract.) Roberts *et al.* teaches a visual bracketing effect by displaying different semantic information in fore and after visualizations. (See § 2.2.) Roberts *et al.* further teaches an inner part that contains the detail view while the bracketed visualizations contain the context information at a lower level of detail. (See *id.*)

However, unlike the claimed subject matter, and contrary to the assertion of the Examiner on pp. 5-6 of Examiner's Answer dated November 17, 2008, Roberts *et al.* fails to teach displaying a detailed subset of information, including textual information, in the lens component based upon the search result, where the detailed subset of information is animated to enlarge in size and *to include additional textual information that is selected from the at least one search result for insertion into the detailed subset of information based in part on a query* associated with the at least one search result. Instead, Roberts *et al.* teaches a sliding window methodology that acts similar to a fish-eye view, where the center window displays the *full resolution* and a lower level of detail is shown on either side. (See Sec. 3, ¶ 5; Fig. 1.) Roberts *et al.* also teaches that after a user submits a query, a set of results are visualized, where one result is shown in *full detail* (focus view), the next *n* results are displayed as URLs on either side of the focus view, and the remaining results are shown as greeked lines. (See Sec. 4.1, ¶ 1; Fig. 4.) Thus, Roberts *et al.*

simply teaches one result that is shown in *full detail*. (See Examiner's Answer dated November 17, 2008, p. 5.) The one full-detail result taught in Roberts *et al.* is **not additional** textual information that is *selected* from a search result for insertion into the detailed subset of information, comprising initial textual information, where the *additional* textual information is *selected* for insertion *based in part on the query*. Contrary to the assertion of the Examiner at p. 20 of the Examiner's Answer dated November 17, 2008, the URL or greeked lines of a search result are not a detailed subset of information, comprising textual information, of a search result, where the full-detail result is additional textual information. Further, the full-detail result is not additional textual information selected for insertion *based in part on the query*. The *full-detail* result is merely the result that was returned by the search engine in response to the query.

Further, Pook *et al.* fails to cure the deficiencies of Roberts *et al.* with regard to the claimed subject matter. Pook *et al.* relates to zoomable user interfaces. (See p. 143, § 5.) Pook *et al.* teaches that users change the scale of their view of the information space depending on the level of detail that they want to see at a given moment. (See p. 115, § 4.4.) Pook *et al.* also teaches semantic zooming where, as a user zooms on an object, the object grows until it vanishes and is replaced by other objects that represent the same underlying information but in more detail. (See *id.*) However, Pook *et al.* fails to teach animating a subset of information to enlarge in size and to include *additional textual information that is selected from a search result for insertion into the subset of information based in part on a query* associated with the at least one search result. Instead, Pook *et al.* teaches that static portals can be used in semantic zooming. (See pp. 115-116, § 4.4.1.) Pook *et al.* is silent regarding inserting additional textual information into a subset of information, comprising textual information, based in part on a query.

In contrast, the claimed subject matter can include a defined area (*e.g.*, lens area) in an interface wherein a detailed subset of information, such as information related to a search result(s), can be displayed. (See Fig. 1; p. 5, ln. 13 – p. 6, ln. 2.) In one aspect, when a search result is placed and/or displayed within the lens area, **additional textual information** and/or other information associated with that search result can be **inserted into the detailed subset of information** displayed within the lens area, as compared to the amount of information that is displayed when the search result is outside the lens area. (See Figs. 1, 4, and 5; p. 4, lns. 19-21; p. 5, ln. 17 – p. 6, ln. 8; p. 9, ln. 24 – p. 10, ln. 7 and Table 1.) The **additional textual information** can be **selected from the search result for insertion into the detailed subset of**

information based in part on the query associated with the search result (e.g., query-relevant text insertion). (See *id.*) In another aspect, a subset of information displayed within the lens area can be animated to enlarge in size (e.g., magnify in size) as compared to information displayed outside of the lens area in the interface. (See Figs. 1 and 5; p. 5, ln. 17 – p. 6, ln. 8; p. 9, ln. 24 – p. 10, ln. 7 and Table 1.)

Independent claim 21 (and similarly independent claim 20) recites: *inserting additional content associated with the at least one of the search results within the lens region, the additional content is selected from the at least one of the search results for insertion within the lens region based in part on a query associated with the at least one of the search results.*

Roberts *et al.* and Pook *et al.*, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest this distinctive aspect of the claimed subject matter.

For at least reasons similar to the reasons stated herein with regard to independent claim 1, Roberts *et al.* and Pook *et al.*, either alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest the distinctive aspects of the claimed subject matter. For instance, Roberts *et al.* and Pook *et al.* fail to teach selecting additional content associated with a search result for insertion within a lens region of an interface based in part on the query associated with the search result, when the search result is displayed within the lens region. Rather, Roberts *et al.* teaches one result that is shown in *full detail* with results on either side displayed as URLs or greeked lines. (See Sec. 4.1, ¶ 1; Fig. 4; see also Examiner's Answer dated November 17, 2008, p. 11.) Thus, Roberts *et al.* simply teaches *one result* that is shown in *full detail*. The one full-detail result taught in Roberts *et al.* is *not additional* content that is selected from a search result for insertion within a lens region where the *additional* content is *selected* for insertion *based in part on the query* associated with the search result. Further, URLs and greeked lines are not content associated with a search result.

In contrast, the claimed subject matter can facilitate capturing and inserting additional content associated with a search result while the search result is within a lens region. The *additional content*, for insertion, can be *selected* from the search result *based in part on the query* that produced the search result (e.g., query-relevant text insertion). (See Figs. 1, 4, and 5; p. 4, lns. 19-21; p. 5, ln. 17 – p. 6, ln. 8; p. 9, ln. 24 – p. 10, ln. 7 and Table 1.)

Independent claim 25 recites: *a lens component to present at least one of the one or more display objects in a different format with respect to a collection of the one or more data items,*

the different format comprises animation of the at least one of the one or more display objects to magnify that display object in size and modify that display object to include additional text that is retrieved from a result to be included in the display object based in part on a query associated with the result, as compared to display objects outside of the lens component. For at least reasons similar to the reasons stated herein with regard to independent claim 1, Roberts *et al.* and Pook *et al.*, either alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest this distinctive feature of the claimed subject matter. Contrary to the assertion of the Examiner on p. 13 of Examiner's Answer dated November 17, 2008, Roberts *et al.* does not teach animation of a display object to modify that display object to *include additional text* that is *retrieved* from a result to be included in the display object *based in part on the query* associated with the result. Rather, Roberts *et al.* simply teaches displaying one *full-detail* search result. (See Sec. 4.1, ¶ 1; Fig. 4; *see also* Examiner's Answer dated November 17, 2008, p. 13.) The URLs and greeked lines, as taught in Roberts *et al.*, are not text that is retrieved from a result, therefore, the full-detail search result is not additional text that is retrieved from the result. Further, Roberts *et al.* fails to teach retrieving the additional text from the result *based in part on the query* associated with the result. The *full-detail* result is merely the result that was returned by the search engine in response to the query – additional text is not retrieved from the result based on the query.

The claimed subject matter can employ query-relevant text insertion to capture additional information from a search result ***based in part on the query***. (See p. 6, lns. 5-8.) The claimed subject matter can modify a display object to include the additional information in the display object when the display object is within the display area of the lens component. (See Figs. 1, 4, and 5; p. 4, lns. 19-21; p. 5, ln. 17 – p. 6, ln. 8; p. 9, ln. 24 – p. 10, ln. 7 and Table 1.)

In view of at least the foregoing, it is readily apparent that Roberts *et al.* and Pook *et al.*, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed subject matter as recited in independent claim 1, 20, 21, and 25 (and associated dependent claims 2-6, 10, 12, 15-19, 22-24, 26, and 27). Accordingly, the subject claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection be reversed.

III. Regarding the Rejection of Claim 13 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner incorrectly maintains the rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roberts *et al.* in view of Pook *et al.* and further in view of Wolton *et al.* (US Pub. No. 2004/0030741). For at least the reasons stated in Appellants' Appeal Brief dated August 6, 2008, and stated herein with regard to independent claim 1, the rejection of claim 13 should be reversed. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be reversed.

IV. Regarding the Rejection of Claim 14 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner incorrectly maintains the rejection of claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roberts *et al.* in view of Pook *et al.* and further in view of Montague (US Pub. No. 2005/0168488). For at least the reasons stated in Appellants' Appeal Brief dated August 6, 2008, and stated herein with regard to independent claim 1, the rejection of claim 14 should be reversed. In view of at least the foregoing alone, the rejection should be reversed.

V. Regarding the Rejection of Claim 18 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner incorrectly maintains the rejection of claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roberts *et al.* in view of Pook *et al.* and further in view of Szabo (US Pub. No. 2007/0156677) (hereinafter "Szabo"). It is requested that this rejection be reversed for at least the following reason. Roberts *et al.*, Pook *et al.*, and Szabo, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest each and every element of the claimed subject matter.

Claim 18 depends from independent claim 1. Szabo fails to cure the aforementioned deficiencies of Roberts *et al.* and Pook *et al.* with respect to independent claim 1. For at least the foregoing reason, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Further, Claim 18 additionally recites: ***the dynamic information view is coordinated with an amount of information to progressively insert additional information associated with the at least one search result into the detailed subset of information according to an amount of time a mouse hovers over the at least one search result.*** Roberts *et al.*, Pook *et al.*, and Szabo, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest this distinctive functionality of the claimed subject matter.

Contrary to the assertion of the Examiner on p. 17 of Examiner's Answer dated

November 17, 2008, for at least the reasons stated in Appellants' Appeal Brief dated August 6, 2008, and the reasons stated herein with regard to independent claim 1, Roberts *et al.* and Pook *et al.* fail to teach *progressively inserting additional information* associated with a search result into a detailed subset of information. Rather, Roberts *et al.* simply teaches showing a full-detail result.

Further, Szabo fails to teach the distinctive functionality as recited in the claimed subject matter. Rather, Szabo relates to a user interface wherein the user may "hover", or hold a graphic cursor near a screen object, to trigger a change in display rather than requiring a mouse click. (See p. 41, ¶ [0349].) However, Szabo fails to teach *progressively inserting additional information associated with a search result* into the detailed subset of information according to an amount of time a mouse hovers over the search result. Instead, Szabo teaches that while hovering, the user can increase the detail to see siblings, parents, and dependents related to taxonomic categories. (See p. 41, ¶¶ [0345]-[0350].) Szabo does not teach progressively inserting additional information related to a search result nor does Szabo teach progressive insertion of additional information based on the amount of time the mouse hovers over a search result.

Conversely, the claimed subject matter can progressively insert information related to a search result in a detailed subset of information, when the search result is displayed in an area within the lens component, based in part on the amount of time a mouse hovers over the search result. (See Figs. 4 and 5; p. 9, lns. 24-26; p. 3, lns. 3-5.) For example, the longer the mouse hovers over the search result in the lens component area, the more information related to the search result is inserted into the detailed subset of information related to the search result.

In view of at least the foregoing, it is readily apparent that Roberts *et al.*, Pook *et al.*, and Szabo, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed subject matter as recited in claim 18. Accordingly, the rejection should be reversed.

VI. Conclusion

For at least the above reasons, the claims currently under consideration are believed to be patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejections of claims 1-27 be reversed.

If any additional fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP607US].

Respectfully submitted,
AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/
Himanshu S. Amin
Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
127 Public Square
57th Floor, Key Tower
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone: (216) 696-8730
Facsimile: (216) 696-8731